

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,862	. 12/28/2000	Yun Lung Chen	1916	2191
25859	25859 7590 02/23/2006		EXAMINER	
WEI TE CHUNG			PATEL, NIHIR B	
FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC.				
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			3743	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/750,862	CHEN, YUN LUNG			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Nihir Patel	3743			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Re	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>December 7th, 2005</u> .					
,	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
•		P - P				
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,4-11 and 13-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 						
· ·		with forth consideration.				
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11 and 13-20</u> is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-9,21 and 22</u> is/are rejected.						
• -	aim(s) <u>1,4-3,27 and 22</u> is/are rejected. aim(s) <u>10</u> is/are objected to.					
, —	8) Claim(s) 10 Is/are objected to: 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
• •	e specification is objected to by the Examine	er				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
,—	oplicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s						
	f References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) Informati	f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 o(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on December 7th, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the slots (4) in Houdry is provided for welding the so called connecting tab to the tube and therefore the applicant's invention is distinguishably different from Houdry. The examiner disagrees. The slots of Houdry is provided for welding as well as receiving an end of the connecting tab of an adjacent one of the fins as an be seen from figure 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (US 5,959,837) in view of Houdry (US 2,216,778). Referring to claims 1, 21 and 22, Yu discloses the applicant's invention as claimed with the exception of providing fins that comprises

Art Unit: 3743

a through hole that forms a connecting tab extending around a periphery of the through hole, a slot being defined in the connecting tab of each of the fins and receiving an end of the connecting tab of an adjacent one of the fins. Houdry discloses a heat exchanger member and method of making that does provide fins that comprises a through hole that forms a connecting tab extending around a periphery of the through hole, a slot being defined in the connecting tab of each of the fins and receiving an end of the connecting tab of an adjacent one of the fins (see figures 1 through 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Yu's invention by providing fins that comprises a through hole that forms a connecting tab extending around a periphery of the through hole, a slot being defined in the connecting tab of each of the fins and receiving an end of the connecting tab of an adjacent one of the fins as taught by Houdry in order improve the heat transfer process.

Referring to claims 4, Yu discloses the applicant's invention as claimed with the exception of providing a pair of locating portions extending from each of the fins for forming intervals between the fins. Houdry discloses a heat exchanger member and method of making that does provide a pair of locating portions extending from each of the fins for forming intervals between the fins (see figures 1 through 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Yu's invention by providing a pair of locating portions extending from each of the fins for forming intervals between the fins as taught by Houdry in order to improve the heat transfer process.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (US 5,959,837) in view of Houdry (US 2,216,778) as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of Gebelius (US 3,780,797). Referring to claims 5, Yu discloses the applicant's invention as

Art Unit: 3743

claimed with the exception of providing a pair of abutting flanges respectively extending vertically towards each other from free ends of the locating portions of each of the fins, for abutting an adjacent one of the fins. Houdry discloses fins but fails to disclose a pair of abutting flanges that respectively extend vertically towards each other from free ends of the locating portions of each of the fins for abutting an adjacent one of the fins. Gebelius discloses convectors that does provide a pair of abutting flanges respectively extending vertically towards each other from free ends of the locating portions of each of the fins, for abutting an adjacent one of the fins (see figures 2 and 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Yu's invention by providing a pair of abutting flanges respectively extending vertically towards each other from free ends of the locating portions of each of the fins, for abutting an adjacent one of the fins as taught by Gebelius in order to improve the heat transfer process.

Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (5,959,837) in view of Buschow et al. (US 2,585,912). **Referring to claims 6,** Yu discloses the applicant's invention as claimed with the exception of providing duct that is made of highly heat-conductive metal. Buschow discloses a regenerator for the recovery of the cold content of gases that does provide duct that is made of highly heat-conductive metal. Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Yu's invention by providing duct that is made of highly heat-conductive metal as taught by Buschow in order to improve the heat transfer process.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (US 5,959,837) in view of Lai (US 5,509,465). Referring to claims 8, Yu discloses the applicant's invention as claimed with the exception of providing at least one of the casing that defines a pair of end tabs for abutting outmost fins. Lai discloses a heat-dissipating device for a central

processing unit chip that does provide at least one of the casing that defines a pair of end tabs for abutting outmost fins (see figure 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Yu's invention by roviding at least one of the casing that defines a pair of end tabs for abutting outmost fins as taught by Lai in order to improve the heat transfer process.

Referring to claim 9, Yu discloses the applicant's invention as claimed with the exception of providing a latching hole that is defined in each of the casings for interferentally engaging with the duct. Lai discloses a heat-dissipating device for a central processing unit chip that does provide a latching hole that is defined in each of the casings for interferentally engaging with the duct (see figure 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to modify Yu's invention by providing a latching hole that is defined in each of the casings for interferentally engaging with the duct as taught by Lai in order to improve the heat transfer process.

Referring to claims 7, Yu discloses applicant's invention as claimed with the exception that Yu doesn't provide an L- shaped casing to hold the duct and fins together but rather provides a different shape of frame. You can have an L-shaped frame or an O shaped frame it is a matter of design choice, and it will not solve any stated problem or produce any new and/or unexpected results.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11 and 13-20 are allowed.

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nihir Patel whose telephone number is (703)306-3463. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 to 4:30 every other fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennett can be reached on 703-308-0101. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

Art Unit: 3743

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nihir Patel February 7th, 2006

Henry Bennett

Supervisory Paterit E